



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/798,366

03/12/2004

Stanislav M. Snair

000417.00018

6070

22907 7590 07/10/2008

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

1100 13th STREET, N.W.

SUITE 1200

WASHINGTON, DC 20005-4051

EXAMINER

LOPEZ, CARLOS N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1791

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/10/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/31/07 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Snaidr et al WO 98/16125. Claim 29 discloses a porous tubular element comprising cerium oxide. The tubular element encases a tobacco charge, which is deemed as the claimed tobacco rod.

Claims 1,4-7, 12-14,17-18, 20-21, and 45-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bowen et al US 6,286,516 or alternatively under 35 U.S.C.

Art Unit: 1791

102(a) as being anticipated by Bowen et al WO 99/53778. '516 reference will be cited in the instant rejection. Bowen discloses a cigarette side-stream smoke treatment material. The treatment material may be wrapped over and be in substantial contact with a cigarette (Col. 5, lines 15ff). The treatment material is comprised of a first component comprising a porous non-combustible material, see Col. 4, lines 1ff, which as noted in col. 7 lines 5ff and in column 8, lines 45ff is a sorbitive material such as zeolites. The second component of the treatment material is incorporated in the first component, see Col 4, lines 1ff, for which it is an oxygen storage component such as cerium oxide, see Col. 7, lines 40ff. As noted in Col. 7, lines 33ff, the cerium oxide is in situ or applied to the surface of the zeolite. Hence, the claimed porous material having cerium oxide is anticipated by Bowen et al.

In addition to the first and second components, a catalyst is added to the treatment material selected, among other things from rare earth metals oxides, platinum oxides, and transition metal oxides, see Col. 8, lines 34ff, hence reading on claims 6-7, 17-18, 21

As for claims 14, the cerium oxide is in situ or applied to the surface of the zeolite, see Col. 7, lines 33ff.

As for claim 5, applying to the surface of the zeolite as noted in above, inherently creates a layer of the cerium oxide.

As for claim 45-46, Column 4, lines 7ff of Bowen notes that the oxygen storage component releases oxygen at temperature of 300⁰C, wherein the free burn rate temperature of the cigarette ranges from 400⁰C -900⁰C as noted in Col. 13, lines 50ff.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 8, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowen et al WO 99/53778 ('778) in view of Schlatter et al (US 5,040,551). As noted in page 13 of '778, catalyst material may be added to the oxygen storage material and treatment material (zeolite). '778 further notes that catalyst is used to promote various reactions and may be transition metal oxides. '778 is silent disclosing Iron oxide as a transition metal oxide. However, Schlatter, at Col. 4, lines 16ff, teaches of using Iron oxide to reduce carbon monoxide in cigarette smoke. Hence, at the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have used iron oxide as '778's catalyst as taught by Schlatter in order to reduce carbon monoxide in cigarette smoke.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowen et al WO 99/53778 ('778). Bowen is silent disclosing the loading rate of the cerium oxide. However, it does note that cerium oxide is used to ensure that the conventional free burn rate of tobacco is maintained, a showing of a result effective variable. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have conducted routine experimentation on the amount of cerium oxide in order to provide burn rates of conventional cigarettes. An optimum amount of cerium oxide

Art Unit: 1791

would be obvious to be determined in order to assure that an overload of cerium oxide does not decrease the number of puff a cigarette can provide due to an increase oxygen release.

Claims 10-11,15-16, 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowen et al WO 99/53778 ('778) in view of Grodek (US 5,004, 711). As noted above, Bowen teaches of using sorbitive material using a zeolite that may provide a dual purpose, sorbent material and catalyst material. '778 is silent disclosing other types of sorbent material. However, Grodek teaches that zirconium oxide is an adsorbent (Col. 11, lines 55) that can be used in cigarettes to filter smoke. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have used other known sorbent material such zirconium oxide as taught by Grodek, as the sorbent material for '778, in order to provide alternate sources of sorbent material.

As for claims 22-23, Bowen notes of using other catalyst such as transition metal oxides, which encompasses the claimed zirconium oxide, see page 14, lines 5ff, when mixed with the cerium oxide and zeolite the above noted treatment material meets the claimed invention as recited in claims 22- 23.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140

Art Unit: 1791

F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1,12,20, and 45-46 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 5 and 13 of U.S. Patent No. 6,286,516('516). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 5 and 13 of '516 discloses a cigarette comprised of a cerium oxide provided on a non-combustible porous particulate. Hence, it is obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art that the cerium oxide provided on a porous adjunct meets the claimed limitation of a porous particulate cerium oxide.

As for claims 45-46, in view that claims 5 and 13 provides for the claimed porous particulate adjunct and the claimed cerium oxide, it would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have expected the catalyst to release oxygen at free burn rate temperatures of the cigarette.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10/31/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant main argument is that the applied references do not disclose a combustible wrapper.

Applicant points out at page 17, that "combustible" and "non-combustible" have different meanings and further points out that "non-combustible" means not consumed.

It is recognized that the art considers term "non-combustible" to refer to material not combusted when the cigarette is smoked but the art does not explicitly define, as applicant's allegation does, that "combustible" means material that is consumed when the cigarette is smoked. Hence, absent any explicit definition in the instant specification or art recognized meaning of the term "combustible", a broad interpretation defining the term "combustible" has been considered by the Examiner.

As previously pointed out in the last office action, it is considered that every material is "combustible" at a specific temperature. When the art specifies that it is "non-combustible" it is merely stating that it does not combust at cigarette burning temperature but it is not a statement that "non-combustible" material does not subsequently combust at higher temperatures. Hence, the material disclosed by the cited prior is deemed to read on the instant claimed invention. Applicant has not in the specification, through a declaration, or in the claims defined the term "combustible" in the manner instantly argued.

In Applicant's response dated 4/10/08, last paragraph of page 19, applicant argues that the "cited document (Bowen 516) does not contemplate that sidestream smoke control can be realized by combined use of an oxygen storage and donor metal

oxide...in combination with a porous adjunct.” It is noted that such features are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In response to the rejections of claims 8 and 19, applicant argues that Schlatter "discloses nothing relevant to the rejected claims, and applicant respectfully traverses this rejection..." Applicant's arguments fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

In regards to the rejection of claim 9, applicant argues that impermissible hindsight reconstruction has occurred to reject claim 9. Bowen notes that cerium oxide is used to ensure that the conventional free burn rate of tobacco is maintained, a showing of a result effective variable. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have conducted routine experimentation on the amount of cerium oxide in order to provide burn rates of conventional cigarettes. An optimum amount of cerium oxide would be obvious to be determined in order to assure that an overload of cerium oxide does not decrease the number of puff a cigarette can provide due to an increase oxygen release. Hence, there is no hindsight reconstruction as applicant alleges.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carlos Lopez whose telephone number is 571.272.1193. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 8am - 5pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven Griffin can be reached on 571.272.1189. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1791

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Carlos Lopez/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1791

CL

<div>Application Number</div> <div></div>	Application/Control No.	Applicant(s)/Patent under Reexamination	
	10/798,366	SNAIDR ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Carlos Lopez	1791	